

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1-61 have been canceled. Claims 62-63, 69, 76, 82, 89, and 91-93 have been amended. Claims 62-109 are currently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 62-66, 68-72, 74-79, 81-85, and 87-109 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Gupta (U.S. Patent No. 5,913,061). The Examiner also rejected claims 67, 73, 80, and 86 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of Butterworth (U.S. Patent No. 5,457,797). These rejections were discussed in a telephone interview conducted on September 13, 2007, between the Examiner and the undersigned attorney.

During the interview, the Examiner requested that the claims be amended to replace the term "capable" with "operable". The claims have been so amended.

Also, during the interview, the undersigned attorney pointed out that both of the independent claims 62 and 93 contained a recitation that the first and second interfaces communicate with each other without using the central registry as an intermediary. The undersigned attorney argued that such a limitation is neither disclosed nor suggested by Gupta. As shown by blocks 103-109 in Fig. 2 of Gupta, the connectors of Gupta (which have been interpreted to be the interfaces recited in the claims) communicate through an interchange server. Specifically, a first connector receives information from a first application at an application end of the first connector (block 103). This information is transferred to an interchange end of the first connector (block 104). The interchange end

transforms the information and publishes an event (block 105). The interchange server then delivers the event to a first application collaboration module (block 106). The first application collaboration module processes an interoperability function and generates an object (block 108). Then, the interchange server delivers the object to a second connector (block 109). As this discussion shows, in Gupta, the first connector communicates with the second connector by going through the interchange server (which maintains a registry). Unlike the independent claims 62 and 93, there is no teaching or suggestion in Gupta of enabling the connectors to communicate with each other without using the interchange server as an intermediary.

The Examiner took these arguments under advisement. Although complete agreement was not reached at the end of the interview, the Examiner did acknowledge that the claims, as amended, most likely distinguished over the art of record. The undersigned attorney thanks the Examiner for this acknowledgement.

In light of the above discussion, it is believed by Applicants that all of the pending claims are patentable over the art of record. Hence, allowance of the pending claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (408) 414-1080 to discuss any issues that may advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: October 1, 2007

/BobbyKTruong#37499/

Bobby K. Truong

Reg. No. 37,499

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 234
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION VIA EFS-WEB

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)(1)(ii), I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent & Trademark Office via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §§1.6(1)(4) and 1.8(a)(1)(i)(C) on the date indicated below and before 9:00 PM PST.

Submission date: October 1, 2007

by /BobbyKTruong#37499/